UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/596,304	06/08/2006	Spiros Gratsias	011348-0021-999	5133	
20583 JONES DAY	7590 05/06/201	0	EXAMINER		
222 EAST 41ST ST			PAYER, HWEI SIU CHOU		
NEW YORK, NY 10017			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3724		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/06/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/596,304	GRATSIAS ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	HWEI-SIU C. PAYER	3724		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	VIS SET TO EVOIDE 2 MONTH/	S/ OD THIDTY (30) DAVS		
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 Ja</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 14-35 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 14-35 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplished any accomplished any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the option of the second and the option of the second and t	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s)	4) 🖂 Index :	(DTO 442)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/2/2010. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/596,304 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

Detailed Action

The amendment filed on 1/27/2010 has been entered.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 14-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schachter (U.S. Patent No. 4,998,347) in view of King et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,625) and Brown, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0208907).

Schachter shows a shaving system (10) comprising at least one blade (14), a platform (16) and a stainless steel guard bar (12) in the shape of a longitudinal body with a substantially circular cross-section and having two ends (see Fig.4, not labeled) and positioned forward of the at least one blade (14) and parallel to the blade cutting edge (see Fig.1), wherein an elongated space (28) is provided between the guard bar (12) and the platform (16), wherein the guard bar (12) is preformed before assembling to the platform (see column 2, lines 42-46) substantially as claimed except the guard bar (12) is not of the claimed type such that it is parallel to the blade cutting edge "along

its entire length", and Schachter does not explicitly mention how the guard bar (12) is assembled onto the platform (16).

However, it is well known in the shaving art to have the guard bar of a wet shaver parallel to the blade cutting edge along its entire length as evidenced by King et al. (see Fig.1, guard bar 11 parallel to blade cutting edge 12/14 along its entire length).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time this invention was made to modify Schachter by having the guard bar (12) of the type that is parallel to the blade cutting edge along its entire length for the predictable result of gliding the shaver along a skin during shaving operation.

Brown et al. teach assembling two elements (i.e. a blade and a razor housing) by having at least part of one element (i.e. razor housing 16) overmolded two end portions of the other element (i.e. blade 18) to secure the two elements (16,18) together by only the end portions of the other element (blade 18, see Fig.5 and lines 2-3 of the abstract). This is done by positioning the other element (blade 18) in a mold cavity (112) and molding at least part of the one element (housing 16) by injecting plastic in the mold cavity (112), and wherein the at least part of the one element (housing 16) is molded over the two end portions of the other element (18) during the process of molding the one element (16).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify Schachter by assembling the guard bar (12) and the platform (16) together by means of a commercially available method such as the injection molding of Brown, Jr. et al. to facilitate a quick and massive production.

Art Unit: 3724

Regarding claims 18, 24 and 31, while Schachter does not explicitly mention the guard bar (12) being made of wood, however, the claimed wood material is not patentably distinct over Schachter, since applicants have not specifically pointed out the criticality of using the claimed wood material for the guard bar, but have disclosed it as an example of various materials that may be used. Further, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Remarks

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Action Made Final

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3724

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Point of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hwei-Siu C. Payer whose telephone number is 571-272-4511. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for official communications and 571-273-4511 for proposed amendments.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Application/Control Number: 10/596,304 Page 6

Art Unit: 3724

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

H Payer May 4, 2010

/Hwei-Siu C. Payer/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724